## MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Special Meeting

October 27, 1964 9:00 A.M.

Council Chamber, City Hall

The meeting was called to order with Mayor Palmer presiding.

## Roll Call:

Present: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer

Absent: Councilman Shanks

Present also: Jack Klitgaard, Tax Assessor and Collector; Paul Gladden and J. E. Olson, Property Appraisers for Tax Department and Thomas P. de Steiguer, Tax Attorney.

The Mayor announced that this was a Special Meeting of the Council called for the purpose of hearing tax appeals by Mr. Henry W. Hall, J. M. Odom and Associates by E. D. McMullen, Mrs. Virgia Lo Cage, Mr. Forrest Himes, Mr. Edward Joseph, Mrs. Fannie U. L. Brown, Mrs. Jöe H. Daywood by J. R. Darrouzet, and G. R. and Lois Peterson.

MR. HENRY W. HALL appealed the values as set by the Board of Equalization on the following property:

		Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1964	Assessed Value By Tax Dept.	Value Rendered By Owner	Assessed Value As Fixed By Board
403 Braker Lane Lot A, Wm. Gephart Subd. plus adj.110	Land Imps	Division of Property	\$ 1,778 29,827	\$ 1,330 22,370		\$ 1,330 22,370
x50 ft. John Apple gate Survey	- Total		\$31,605	\$23,700		\$23,700

Mr. Hall represented himself stating there were six rent houses on this property and this was not in a good neighborhood. He said Mr. Klitgaard had told him that the City tax was based on three guides - cost, market price and income of property and land. He submitted to the Council a written statement showing the cost of improvement at \$22,000; an offer of the 6 row houses and the lot for the sum of \$24,500; and a breakdown of the income from the property showing \$3,528 received from rent (\$49.50 per month) and expenditures for upkeep, etc. at \$2499 for a net profit of \$1029. He also submitted a written statement showing there were 5280 sq. ft. in the houses, garage or carports and storage, and figured at \$5.16 a sq. ft. it would be \$27,244.80. He said he thought the houses should be taxed for what it cost him to build them. He stated the land was about right.

He indicated he wanted to build more of these low cost houses but would be prohibited from doing so if they were taxed 1/3 more than it cost to build. The Mayor stated the Council would go out and look at this and give Mr. Hall an answer as soon as possible.

MR. CHARLES MORTON representing J. M. ODOM AND ASSOCIATES appealed the values as set by the Board of Equalization on the following property:

Full Value			Value	Assessed
	By Tax		Rendered	
Dept. 1963	Dept. 1964	Tax Dept.	By Owner	Fixed By
				Board
·				

I.R.S. Center, 15 Acres, Santiago Del Valle Grant	Land Imps	Property Combined	\$ 90,000 2,170,058	\$ 67,500 \$ 56,250 \$ 67,500 1,627,450 1,627,540 1,627,450
Der Agrie Grafic	Total		\$2,260,058	\$1,694,950 \$1,683,790 \$1,694,950

Mr. Morton stated they were appealing the value of the land only. He said the land cost \$75,000 and they had rendered it at \$56,250 as being 75% of the actual purchase price. Mr. Klitgaard explained that last year only the front part of the tract was on for \$6,000 an acre and now \$6,000 was on the whole unit. The I.R.S. Center is located on this property and when the G.S.A. obtained an option on this land \$5,000 an acre was agreed to.

MRS. VIRGIA LO CAGE appealed the values as set by the Board of Equalization on the following property:

		Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1964	Assessed Value By Tax Dept.	Value Rendered By Owner	Assessed Value As Fixed By Board
Old Lockhart Hwy. and Chunn Lane, 96.969 Acres,	Land Imps	\$48,926 2,847	\$48,926 2,847	\$36,690 2,140	\$30,000 2,140	\$36,690 2,140
Santiago Del Valle Grant	Total	\$51,773	\$51,773	\$38,830	\$32,140	\$38,830

Mrs. Cage stated she was appealing the value of the land only. She said most of this land was very rough and could not be used. It was brought out that there was a gas line easement and an electric easement across the property. She said the electric easement went all over her property and a spring had been ruined by the easement being granted by her. She said she would not be interested in selling any of this property at any price as it was her home and she wanted to keep it. The Mayor said the Council would go out and look at the property and give Mrs. Cage an answer as soon as possible.

MR. FORREST HIMES appealed the values as set by the Board of Equalization on the following property:

		Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1964	Assessed Value By Tax Dept.	Value Rendered By Owner	Assessed Value As Fixed By Board
1408 Norwalk Lane S. 80 ft. of E. 139 ft. of Lot 5, Block 8, Westfield	Land Imps	\$ 2,873 26,557	\$ 8,340 26,503	\$ 6,260 19,880	\$ 2,150 19,920	\$ 6,260 17,570
A A	Total	\$29,430	\$34,843	\$26,140	\$22,070	\$23,830

Mr. Himes represented himself stating he was appealing the value of the land only. He said there were six family type apartments with parking in front. He stated there was a 10' easement on the south line of the property and all of his property could not be used because of the easement, and he felt when the City holds an easement and controls that much land there should be some consideration. He contended that this lot did not have the value of the adjoining property as there is a 75' set-back deed restriction which he had to comply when his apartment was built and new development does not. It was brought out that this easement was for a covered storm sewer. Mr. Himes said he could not build a carport or a driveway over this easement. The Mayor said the Council would go look at this property.

MR. EDWARD JOSEPH appealed the values as set by the Board of Equalization on the following property:

		Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1964	Assessed Value By Tax Dept.	Value Rendered By Owner	Assessed Value As Fixed By Board
Adjacent to Nelson Field, 21.5 Acres, James P. Wallace		\$ 9,960 	\$29,880 -0-	\$22,410	Not Ren- dered	\$22,410
and 3.4 Ac. Willis Avery Survey	Total	\$ 9,960	\$29,880	\$22,410		\$22,410

Mr. Joseph said there was no access to this property, that you had to go through two gates and private property to get to it. He stated that 8 acres of this land was an abandoned gravel pit; the land is now being used for grazing purposes; there was a 50' high line easement across the land and there was no water and sewer. He said he bought this property 3 years ago for \$1,000 per acre in an easy deal of \$1,000 in cash and \$100 a month with 4% interest. He felt the increase of over 200% was excessive and a 10% increase each year for 5 years would be fair. He said the land between his and the City would have to be developed before his could be developed and at this time no value could be put on this property except for grazing.

		Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1964	Assessed Value By Tax Dept.	Value Rendered By Owner	Assessed Value As Fixed By Board
Rundberg In,47.82 Acres, John Apple- gate Survey	Land Imps	\$19,128 	\$47,820 0-	\$35,870 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$35,870 -0-
gate buivey	Total	\$19,128	\$47,820	\$35,870		\$35,870
Rutherford Ln, 2 Acres, James P.	Land Imps	\$ 1,000	\$ 2,500 0-	\$ 1,880 O-	Not Ren- dered	\$ 1,880 -0-
	Total	\$ 1,000	\$ 2,500	\$ 1,880		\$ 1,880
Rutherford Lané 79.41 Acres, Wm. Wilkes Survey	Land Imps	\$31 <b>,7</b> 64 <u>1,484</u>	\$79,410 1,484	\$59,560 1,110	Not Ren- dered	\$59,560 1,110
withes parvey	Total	\$3 <b>3,2</b> 48	\$80,894	\$60,670	•	\$60,670
Rutherford Lane 34.49 Acres, James P. Wallace Survey	Land Imps	\$17,245 	\$34,490 -0-	\$25,870 	Not Ren- dered	\$25,870 -0-
T. Herrence Diet Ach	Total	\$17,245	\$34,490	\$25,870		\$25,870

Mr. Joseph was appealing the values of land only. He said these tracts were appraised at \$1,000 an acre (\$1,250 on the 2 acre tract) and he thought the appraisal value should not be more than \$750 an acre. He stated the combined tracts were shown as 161 or 162 acres and it is only a 159 acre tract. He was asked to bring in his survey to the Tax Department. He brought out that the 47.82 acre tract adjoined the Fiskville Cemetery. He said the whole 159 acre tract was rented to a tenant for a dairy and there are 18 acres in a creek bottom. There is city sewer on this property and he said he gave the City the easement. He mentioned two months ago he purchased 28 acres out of the 114 acres Davis Tract for \$700 per acre. He said most of the 159 acres of land was bought in 1950 for \$225 per acre. Mr. Joseph said it would be quite some time before this property could be developed. The Mayor stated the Council would go by and look at all of this property.

		Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1964	Assessed Value By Tax Dept.	Value Rendered By Owner	Assessed Value As Fixed By Board
Anderson Ln., 82.44 Acres, James P. Wallace Survey	Land Imps	\$49,464 <u>6,462</u>	\$144,270 6,462	\$108,200 4,850	Not Ren- dered	\$108,200 4,850
	Total	\$55,926	\$150,732	\$113,050		\$113,050

Mr. Joseph said this tract was actually only 74.59 acres as the State had gotten some right-of-way and this acreage should be separated out from his property. He was asked to bring in his survey. He stated there had been a 190% increase and he felt that \$1200 per acre would be a fair appraisal with a 10% increase each year. The 4 acre tract on the south side of the loop road varies in depth from 39' to 138'. He mentioned he bought a 160 acre tract last year for \$500 per acre. It was brought out this tract is in the Manor School District.

Mr. Joseph said it would be quite some time before this property could be developed.

The Mayor stated the Council would go by and look at all of this property.

MRS. FANNIE U.L. BROWN appealed the values as set by the Board of Equalization on the following property:

	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1964	Assessed Value By Tax Dept.	Value Rendered By Owner	Assessed Value As Fixed By Board
1711 East 12th St. Land 50 x 147 ft., Blks.Imps 13 & 14, Outlot 57,	\$ 4 <b>,7</b> 18 2 <b>,3</b> 33	\$ 4,718 2,333	\$ 3,540 1,750	Not Ren- dered	\$ 3,540 1,750
Division B Total	\$ 7,051	\$ 7,051	\$ 5,290		\$ 5,290

Mrs. Brown said she was appealing the values of both land and improvements. She said the soil was not good and any top soil she had she had to bring in. She said she had been overcharged for many years and interest had been charged and she had tried to get help for the last ten or fifteen years. She submitted letters to the Council to read. Mrs. Brown said the improvements were in bad condition and substandard and she felt the improvements were worth about \$800. The Mayor said the Council would go by and look at this property and give her an answer as soon as possible.

MR. JOE H. DAYWOOD by J. R. Darrouzet, appealed the values as set by the Board of Equalization on the following property:

		Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963	Full Value by Tax Dept. 1964	Assessed Value By Tax Dept.	Value Rendered By Onwer	Assessed Value As Fixed By Board
1900 East 6th Street 120 x 100 ft. of Blk. 2, Outlot 7, Division A, H&TC	Land Imps	\$11,400 5,066	\$11,400 5,436	\$ 8,550 4,080	Not Ren- dered	\$ 8,550 4,080
RR Addition	Total	\$16,466	\$16,836	\$12,630		\$12,630
1902 East 6th St. 50 x 188 ft. avg. Blk. 2, Outlot 7,	Land Imps	\$ 5,160 13,230	\$ 5,160 12,296	\$ 3,870 9,220	Not Ren- dered	\$ 3,870 9,220
Div. A, H&TC RR Addition	Total	\$18,390	\$17,456	\$13,090		\$13,090

Mr. Forrest N. Troutman represented Mr. Daywood in this appeal, as Mr. Darrouzet had to leave the meeting. Mr. Troutman said this appeal was on land and improvements both. He said Mr. Daywood had purchased this property this year for \$27,500. He stated it had been on the market for seven months and there had only been one other offer of \$25,000. He felt it should not be appraised for more than the sale price. He said there was a warehouse and a filling station on the property and it is not worth as much now as when it was leased for the Post Office. He said he received \$125 per month for the warehouse and \$45 per month for the filling station. It was brought out the whole area was declining. The Mayor said the Council would go look at the property.

G. R. and LOIS PETERSON appealed the values as set by the Board of Equalization on the following property:

		ì	ll Value by Tax pt. 1963	ŀ	l Value by Tax pt. 1964	Va.1	sessed ue by Dept.	Value Rendered By Owner	Val Fix	essed ue As ed By eard'
Wedgewood Drive, Lot 9, Block A,	Land Imps	\$	100 -0-	\$	400 -0-	\$	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	300 -0-
Valley Side Hgts.	Total	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300		\$	300
Wedgewood Drive, Lot 8, Block A,	Land Imps	\$	100	\$	400 -0-	\$	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	300 -0-
Valley Side Hgts.	Total	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300		\$	300
Wedgewood Drive, Lot 7, Block A,	Land Imps	\$	100	\$	400 -0-	\$ 	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	300 -0-
Valley Side Hgts.	Total	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300		\$	300
Wedgewood Drive, Lot 6, Block A,	Land Imps	\$	100 -0-	\$	400 -0-	\$	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$ 	300 -0-
Valley Side Hgts.	Total	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300		\$	300
Wedgewood Drive, Lot 5, Block A,	Land Imps	\$	100 -0-	\$	400 -0-	\$	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	300 -0-
Valley Side Hgts.	Total	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300		\$	300
Wedgewood Drive, Lot 4, Block A,	Land Imps	\$	100 -0-	\$	400 -0-	\$	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$ 	300
Valley Side Hgts.	Total	\$	100	\$	400	.\$	300		\$	300
Wedgewood Drive, Lot 3, Block A, Valley Side Hgts.	Land Imps	\$	100 -0-	\$ 	400 -0-	\$	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$ 	300 -0-
Agrica Dine ugos.	Total	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300	•	\$	300

		ħ	by Tax		Full Value by Tax Dept. 1964		essed ue By Dept.	Value Rendered By Owner	Assessed Value As Fixed By Board	
Wedgewood Drive, Lot 2, Block A, Valley Side Hgts.	Land Imps	\$	100	\$ 	400 -0-	\$	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	300 -0-
Total Disconsisted in the second	Total	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300		\$	300
Corner Wedgewood Dr. & Braker In., Lot 1, Block A,	Land Imps	\$	150 -0-	\$	600 -0-	\$	450 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	450 -0-
Valley Side Hgts.	Total	\$	150	\$	600	\$	450		\$	450
Wedgewood Drive, Lot 1, Block E, Valley Side Hgts.	Land Imps	\$	100	\$	400 -0-	\$	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	<u>-0-</u>
varies bide ligos.	Total	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300		\$	300
Wedgewood Drive, Lot 2, Block E, Valley Side Hgts.	Land Imps	\$	100 -0-	\$	400 -0-	\$	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	-0- 300
variey Side Hgts.	Total	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300		\$	300
Wedgewood Drive, Lot 1, Block D, Valley Side Hgts.	Land Imps	\$	100	\$	400 -0-	\$	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	<u>-0-</u>
valley blue ligos.	Total	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300		\$	300
Wedgewood Drive, Lot 2, Block D, Valley Side Hgts.	Land Imps	\$	100 -0-	\$	400 -0-	\$	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	300 -0-
variey blue ligos.	Total	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300		\$	300
Braker Lane, Lot 8, Block C, Valley Side Heights	Land Imps	\$	250 -0-	\$	600 -0-	\$	450 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	450 -0-
Dide Medghob	Total	\$	250	\$	600	\$	450		\$	450
Braker Lane, Lot 7, Block C, Valley Side Heights	Land Imps	\$	175 -0-	\$	600 -0-	\$	450 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$ 	450 -0-
	Total	\$	175	\$	600	\$	450		\$	450
Braker Lane, Lot 6, Block C, Valley Side Heights	Land Imps	\$	150 -0-	\$ —	600 -0-	\$	450 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	450 -0-
	Total	\$	150	\$ .	600	\$	450		\$	450
Braker Lane, Lot 5 Block C, Valley Side Heights	Land Imps	\$	150 -0-	\$	600 -0-	\$	450 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$ 	450 -0-
STAC HOTSHAD	Total	\$	150	\$	600	\$	450		\$	450

		Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963		Full Value by Tax Dept. 1964		Assessed Value By Tax Dept.		Value Rendered By Owner	Assessed Value As Fixed By Board	
Braker Lane, Lot 4 Blk.C, Valley Side Heights		\$	150 -0-	\$	600 -0-	\$ <del>-</del> -	450 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	450 -0-
	Total	\$	150	\$	600	\$	450		\$	450
Braker Lane, Lot 3 Blk.C, Valley Side Heights		\$ —	150 -0-	\$	600 -0-	\$	450 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	450 -0-
	Total	\$	150	\$	600	\$	450		\$	450
Braker Lane, Lot 2 Blk.C, Valley Side Heights	Land Imps	\$	150 -0-	\$	600 -0-	\$	450 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	450 -0-
	Total	\$	150	\$	600	\$	450		\$	450
Corner Braker Lane & Wedgewood Drive Lot 1,Block C Valley Side Hgts.	Land Imps	\$	150 -0-	\$	600 -0-	\$	450 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	450 -0-
	Total	\$	150	\$	600	\$	450		\$	450
Wedgewood Drive Lot 9, Block C Valley Side Hgts.	Land Imps	\$	100 -0-	\$	400 -0-	\$ 	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	300 -0-
	Total	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300		\$	300
Wedgewood Drive Lot 1, Block H Valley Side Hgts.	Land Imps	\$	100 -Ò-	\$	400 -0-	\$	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	<u>-0-</u>
	Total	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300		\$	300
Wedgewood Drive Lot 1, Block G Valley Side Hgts.	Land Imps	\$	100	\$	400 -0-	\$	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	300 -0-
	Total	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300		\$	300
Wedgewood Drive Lot 2, Block G Valley Side Hgts.	Land Imps	\$	100 -0-	\$	400 -0-	\$	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	300 -0-
	Total	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300		\$	300
Wedgewood Drive Lot 3, Block G Valley Side Hgts.	Land Imps	\$	100	\$	400 -0-	\$ ——	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	300 -0-
	Total	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300		\$	300
Wedgewood Drive Lot 4, Block G Valley Side Hgts.	Land Imps	\$	100	\$ ——	400 -0-	\$	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	300 -0-
	Total	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300		\$	300

		Full Value by Tax Dept. 1963		Full Value by Tax Dept. 1964		Assessed Value By Tax Dept.		Value Rendered By Owner	Assessed Value As Fixed By Board	
Wedgewood Drive Lot 5, Block G Valley Side Hgts.	Land Imps	\$ 	100 -0-	\$	400 -0-	\$ 	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	300 -0-
	Total	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300		\$	300
Wedgewood Drive Lot 6, Block G Valley Side Hgts.	Land Imps	\$ 	100 -0-	\$. 	400 -0-	\$	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	300 -0-
	Total	\$	<b>2.00</b> 0	\$	400	\$	300		\$	300
Wedgewood Drive Lot 7, Block G Valley Side Hgts.	Land Imps	\$	100 -0-	\$	400 -0-	\$	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$ —	300 -0-
	Total.	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300		\$	300
Wedgewood Drive Lot 11, Block A Valley Side Hgts.	Land Imps	\$ —	100 -0-	\$ 	400 -0-	\$ 	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	300 -0-
	Total	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300		\$	300
Wedgewood Drive Lot 10, Block A Valley Side Hgts.	Land Imps	\$	100	\$	400 -0-	\$ 	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$ ·	300 -0-
	Total	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300	•	\$	300
Wedgewood Drive Lot 1, Block F Valley Side Hgts.	Land Imps	\$	100 -0-	\$	400 -0-	\$	300 -0-	Not Ren- dered	\$	300 -0-
	Total	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300		\$	300
Wedgewood Drive Lot 2, Block F Valley Side Hgts.	Land Imps	\$	100	\$	400 -0-	\$	300	Not Ren- dered	\$	300 -0-
	Total:	\$	100	\$	400	\$	300		\$	300
Braker Lane, 19.46 Acres, Thomas May Survey & 5.6 Acres	Iand Imps		\$ 8,971 5,910		\$15,036 5,910		,280 ,430	Not Ren- dered	\$11,280 4,430	
J.C. Harrelson Sur Total		\$14,881		\$20,946		\$15,710			\$15,710	

Mr. Gladden, Tax Department, explained that this property had been subdivided about ten years ago and a plat filed but the subdivision had never been opened and the streets had never been cut. Mrs. Peterson represented her husband and herself in this appeal. She said this should not have been subdivided and should still be in one tract as the subdivision had never been developed. She said this was their homestead and there had been nothing done to improve it. She asked that the appraisals not be raised any higher than they were last year and be lowered if possible. Mrs. Peterson filed a letter with the Council giving the following information; since the community consolidated with the City School District the tax land evaluations continue to increase even though there has been no

improvements on the land; the property was purchased as a homestead; the ravine, the unplatted field and the old fences are the same; there is no city gas or butane on the land; there is no income off of the property; the 1/3 miles road has not been improved; taxes were increased with the water district; they had dedicated a 60' road for the widening of Braker Lane which they were told would be necessary to have their plat approved and to have a water line for the neighbor's land in back; they did not complete the subdivision but city, school and county taxes are paid on individual lots. The Mayor stated the Council would go out and look at this property.

The Council adjourned at 11:55 A.M. subject to the call of the Mayor.

APPROVED Las to E. Palmer

ATTEST: